

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council
Marine Reserves Working Group**

April 18, 2001

8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Veterans Memorial Building

112 W. Cabrillo Blvd.

Santa Barbara, California

MEETING SUMMARY

In Attendance:

Mike Eng – Facilitator

John Jostes - Facilitator

Patty Wolf - Chair

Matt Pickett – Co-Chair

Steve Roberson

Deborah McArdle

Locky Brown

Dan Richards for Gary Davis

Greg Helms

Mark Helvey

Dr. Craig Fusaro

Marla Daily

Bob Fletcher

Shawn Kelly

Dale Glantz

Tom Raftican

Department of Fish and Game Staff – Paul Reilly, John Ugoretz

Sanctuary Staff – Sean Hastings, Satie Airame

Audience – 30+

Introductions

Patty Wolf – We need to think differently today to find real common ground. We should ask ourselves, what do we want to show from this process? This process has required a tremendous amount of investment. There is a lot of attention on us and we can succeed or fail at community based processes. We are out in front and we have made some mistakes.

The Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) is up and running:

- A Master Team is drafting reserve network scenarios
- Public review of spatial options is expected this June
- The webpage is available via the Dept. of Fish and Game homepage
- Public workshops come out in June

- Public comments in July, something likely in September
- Final decision by January by 2002.

The MLPA team is waiting for MRWG to deliver, if we don't they will fill in the map for us. We have this meeting and next one to pull this together – we can discuss timing. I encourage every one to work harder today, put all ideas out, and negotiate constructively. I look forward to what we can put together.

Matt Pickett – I am heartened by the amount of effort between meetings on mapping and working together. I believe progress is being made and there is more agreement than before. The time has come to move this to Fish and Game Commission, Pacific Fisheries Management Council and NOAA. Unfortunately, it is getting very political. I appreciate the two years of hard work and I am optimistic that we can end up with a single reserve map.

Round table MRWG introductions.

Agenda Review

Facilitators Comments:

We have a fleeting opportunity to come to agreement. Last month's forum was information overload, we need to assimilate and apply this information – there has been good work between meetings on building relationships. We have been working with everyone between meetings, and we are encouraged by the effort to reduce impacts of marine reserves in Channel Islands, sharing information and the effort to accomplish the goals. There has been a lot of attention focussed on short term impacts, but there is also a sense that we are doing this for the future, and at times we haven't kept that on the table. This is for the future, we want you to think about what this process is ultimately about, opportunities to bridge short and long term impacts and maximizing gains. Phasing is one idea to bridge.

What kind of Channel Islands do you want your great grand children to experience? Think of the long term – some of us have been thinking about this, impacts are real but so is the future.

We all share long-term goals and aspirations, for our children and grand children - think of insuring their future. As individuals we usually don't have this opportunity, but as a group we do, we are the quality control for any agreement that moves us forward collectively. What happens if this process doesn't work? What opportunities do we have to move collectively forward? Is it worth the risk with your constituents? Risks are necessary, we need some surprises, and there are still significant surprises, think in different ways today. Don't get hung up on percentages, the challenge is to think creatively, don't lose sight what the future is all about..

People have been focused on location, location and location, which is the primary focus of the morning session. We have looked at some concepts, we want to hear about some

options, and focus on a preferred option. In seeking consensus – utilize all of the ideas and tools that are out there. In time or concurrently we will discuss the final recommendation package and work to refine it – and if necessary decide what to do in the absence of consensus – as facilitators we can only do so much. It is your recommendation.

Review of revised draft working recommendation packet.

MRWG presentations on New Reserve Options

Concept E

Multi-MRWG member proposal with most interest represented, except for recreational fishing. This concept seeks to maximize all of the goals and objectives and is really an evolution of the options and information to date. Note north and south side reserves, in all biogeographic zones, an attempt to capture the diversity of habitats, and minimize impact to user groups. Kelp forest monitoring sites are both in and out of proposed reserves, reserves are co-located with important educational access points and ranger stations, like East Anacapa.

Concept F

Formerly known as, “Option C with a hair cut”. The rockfish and prawn fisheries were taking a hit. Working with the NOAA economists and the commercial fleet we decided to accept revenue impacts at approximately 10% across all fisheries. Reserve areas can expand if they are under 10% economic impacts. Concept E looks okay with some trimming around the San Miguel Island (SMI) foul area.

Concept G

Evolution of C with a haircut map, plus some areas that include the phase in concept. The ideas would be to do nearshore reserve areas first and add later, see Craig’s phasing and contingent language.

- ◆ S. SMI – “Liquornik’s Ribbon” provides replication and balance on coverage of Islands.
- ◆ Santa Rosa Island (SRI) SRI Johnson’s Lee – recognizes consumptive diving and differences between south point oceanography.
- ◆ N. SRI is difficult; we propose some Bechers Bay and Beacons reef for valuable habitat - see Greg Helms for rationale.
- ◆ N. Santa Cruz Island (SCI) – West End reserve needed, we want input from Neil Guglielmo.
- ◆ Anacapa Island (ANI) – importance of joining existing MPA’s because people are aware of these areas.
- ◆ Santa Barbara Island (SBI) is conceptual, we feel strongly about addressing CA biogeographic region.
- ◆ Balance open vs. closed areas with proximity to harbors and the needs for conservation.

Greg Helms - Our process is hung up on SBI and ANI – we looked at small nearshore areas, consider phasing and the cowcod conservation area. For Bob Fletcher's constituents it is closed to some extent due to the Cowcod closure and we acknowledge there is some limited conservation from this management. Many MRWG members feel we have to do something with SBI and the warm water Calif. biogeographic zone. In the Cowcod closure the bottom below 20 fathoms is mostly protected and we acknowledge this. Can we consider taking half of the cowcod closure and make it a marine reserve closure? Bob's choice as to which half – we are looking for a reasonable modest closure - this has not been proposed yet for SBI.

Regarding limited take zones – I wish we had larger reserve areas to carve up with gear specific ideas. Splitting small areas is difficult to enforce – if we had more support for no take we could carve up these areas differently so that it works for all of MRWG. I am open to this idea, despite the scientific ambiguity, I am offering up what I will consider, albeit as painful as it is for me.

Craig Fusaro – As long as percentage set-aside is not the driver, with local knowledge we can pick good quality habitat with conservation value.

Chris Miller – The guys I represent can get on board by promising to monitor the status of resources and to envelop stock assessments. Smaller ecological reserves work for us, rather than reserves driven by a large size frame, especially given uncertainty over status of resources.

Shawn Kelly – I am concerned that there is no discussion over phasing, and feel that phasing should be automatic and not driven by unrealistic contingencies and conditions. There is too much uncertainty and ambiguity on performance standards. If a first phase is smaller than the Science Panel recommendation, how can performance standards be derived? Phasing and limited take complicates consideration of maps – we need to agree on automatic time frames. Note that deriving performing standards takes careful planning.

Bob Fletcher - Phasing without achieving funding, enforcement and monitoring is totally unacceptable. If this grand experiment is to get benefits we need adequate monitoring – even if we accept some reserves we can not accept automatic phasing. Nothing the reserve can do will make us comfortable without proof.

Steve Roberson – Let's put phasing aside, and work from Concept E and add or subtract areas.

Craig Fusaro – The concept of space involved and how they are implemented might help us work on places and consider implementation.

Chris Miller – phasing allows us to address congestion.

Shawn Kelly – I don't want to set up a small reserve with phasing – we need some details on performance standards – how about a fourth option – lets look at where and then consider how.

Craig Fusaro– lets talk about what success means.

Lucky Brown– On Concept G – Is inside Gull Island open?

Response - No

Lucky Brown– Can we move these areas? Cavern Point, SCI this area concerns me. On SBI is Sutil Island left open?

Greg Helms - we need to move “deck chairs” around, not add or delete them.

Option H – presented by Tom Raftican

Builds on some of reserve map D. Dotted areas are limited take areas. Given that we have had fishery problems with residential rockfish, we need to keep some areas open to some fishing, like surface fishing for barracuda, yellowtail, white seabass and calico bass. The recreation fishing community does not have extreme detrimental impacts; we will give up rockfish but not others species. Off of SMI, the weather closes this down most of the time, but a trip once in awhile is needed – Include limited impact areas for ANI. We need different ways to consider SBI – maybe open up cowcod closure, this is up to NMFS and the PFMC, perhaps some no take, or inside 20 fathom line open – working with Bob we may find something that works. For north SCI and SRI - look at this as a Marine Conservation Area – take some species, but protect others.

Bob Fletcher – There are lots of other processes that will impact sport fishing opportunities. For us to give up ground in this process is only compounded by future processes –large reserve areas fall on deaf ears, Tom and I are facing a very hostile constituency that doesn't understand why they have to bear the brunt of anymore regulations.

Tom Raftican – Businesses have collapsed, boats have left, we want to put something together that still allows fishing.

Craig Fusaro – Can you give us more detail on ANI and SBI?

Tom Raftican –With the existing ANI closures, maybe they can expand out to 6 miles to protect bottom fish, but allow surface fishing, this will protect bottom habitat. We can't handle this today but maybe by next meeting. For SBI – open up _ of the Island to all fishing, trade some deep water closures, and still meet most of the parameters of the Science Panel. We realize that this will not answer all of the questions. We have addressed everything from the economic and ecological panels, but we haven't addressed the social aspects, the family relationships and the need to utilize resources.

Matt Pickett - Moving Cowcod areas may be in the realm of our recommendation to the DFG and PFMC.

BREAK

Development of Spatial Options

Strawpolls were conducted as a starting point to see where the common ground lies with various options.

Matt Pickett– recommend starting with a larger map, politically easier to cut than to add.

Steven Roberson - support that idea.

Craig Fusaro – probably most of the MRWG has not had time to review the implementation aspects in the recommendation draft.

The MRWG decided to start negotiations from Option E.

Satie Airame responds to MRWG input by mapping in Arc View software on a laptop projected on to a big screen.

Patty Wolf – revisiting cowcod conservation area may be possible – we need an overview of what the area is and isn't. Maybe there is flexibility here.

Negotiated mapping continued with a focus on reserve Option E, starting on an Island by Island basis from San Miguel and heading east. Stawpolling was utilized for each reserve area, anyone at level two (see groundrules) had to describe what issues were not being addressed and offer alternatives to the group to move forward.

Tentative agreement was reached for SMI.

LUNCH

Summary of afternoon

Rigorous debate continued for SRI and SCI. As the MRWG negotiations approached the east end of SCI, with some discussion for SBI, an impasse occurred. Those not supporting the reserve areas proposed for East SCI, ANI and SBI put no acceptable alternatives forth.

John Jostes – it is clear there will not be consensus on a comprehensive map. What can the group do between now and May, should we continue?

Dale Glantz– Continue mapping until we get it refined – send core areas forward.

John Jostes reviewed groundrules relative to not reaching agreement, which stated that areas of agreement and disagreement are forwarded as the recommendation to the SAC.

Michael Eng – we want to make progress on this hard process.

Neil Guglielmo– recommended getting this map printed up, passed out to MRWG, and to our constituents. He does not want CINMS taking over an incomplete map. He is interested in the Science panel feedback for the North side SCI proposed closure.

Sean Hastings offered to have the science and socio-economic panels analyze the current option and provide this feedback to MRWG members so they can share it with their constituents.

Shawn Kelly – concur with Neil and Dale, document lessons learned and catalogue interest, this map clearly does not adequately address the east end of the CINMS.

Bob Fletcher – I will meet with the Sport fishing Association Board of Directors, and sport fishing operators. Maybe there is an opportunity to come up with areas of give and take, we have learned how difficult it is to come together. We will have to turn it over to the FGC to make the final decision. We have all profited from this experience, there is a lot going on that will change the dynamic of resource management. We still don't have a commitment from the agencies, President Bush is proposing minimal increases in the Dept. of Interior and Dept. of Commerce budgets – and this current map is way more than I originally agreed to accept. Note that Calif. is in an energy crisis.

Marla Daily – We need to help the SAC visualize overlap areas where everyone has agreed to a certain cell. Take an extra day, first review with our constituents and see what playing room is available.

Craig Fusaro– what happen to Bob's ANI suggestion? Second observation – we have been at this a long time, I will be disappointed if we wait until the end. We need to think real hard in subgroups and improve on the least common denominator, strive for common ground. We should put a lot of energy into this now and reach out to our constituents and work hard until May 16.

John Jostes – Does the group want facilitation help?

Craig Fusaro – anything you can do in the intervening month can help us.

Mark Helvey– nothing to add, we accomplished a lot of today, I am bothered with trying to force this, can we push back the SAC presentation date? A month may not be enough time- we have momentum now, let's build on it.

Steve Roberson – keep the deadline, work hard to it. There is value if we reach consensus to demonstrate we can work together. What is the alternative? We all argue to the FGC, the problem doesn't go away, there is a huge value in making this work.

Debra McArdle – There is value to having consensus, if we don't this has still been a valuable exercise and we have great data, and we can make better resource decisions. If

we don't reach consensus it doesn't mean reserves don't work, it highlights the variance in the environment and the people involved.

Chris Miller– If the FGC expects a recommendation in August then let's get our act together for them, with formal meetings and informal meetings. I am comfortable with where we are, focus on ANI and SBI, consider reefs and give up one really good reef on each Island to finish the map. People with concern over enough habitat need to get together with the users and get down to a fine scale – the Sanctuary can support the mapping exercise.

Locky Brown– I will be disappointed if this is cut short. I am comfortable with most of what we have done, but I would like to see more resolution, feel this has been a worthwhile process given the circumstances.

Tom Raftican – Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary took 6 years to get 4% closure. We have worked on relationships and saved the most difficult part until the end, we need to work with our constituents.

Dan Richards – amazed how far we got today, this is looking workable and some possible results, pleased with areas of agreement, we can hash out other areas.

Greg Helms – mixed on extending time and not giving up – the last month has shown we can get a lot done. I am struggling to communicate the long-term ecological needs of the Channel Islands and I need to work on this, the relationships have been fruitful, I have to think that if Bruce hadn't offered SMI we would not have much, we need advice from our technical panels.

Dan Richards – remind MRWG that when this goes back to constituents explain how much was given up by every MRWG member.

John Jostes – thinking back, the quality of discussion is smarter, more human and responsive, even some trust. We need a breakthrough and some surprises.

Matt Pickett - thanked everyone for their hard work. I had a moment of clarity watching Helms talk substantively about this area, we understand what is going on at the Islands – we are getting articulate and reaching out. I am uncomfortable with directing the MRWG, as someone who brings the recommendation forward. We need to keep the timeline, we work harder under pressure – in the meantime we will work around the clock to support the MRWG.

Patty Wolf – surprised with progress especially today. The really hard part always happens at the end. There is a lot we can do, with the FGC this issue is on the tentative schedule for late August in Santa Barbara, we need something through the Director in early July.

The meeting adjourned.